

Just because he burned the pie it doesn't mean he isn't a world-class baker!

Another example of Nicos dysfunctional reasoning behind the colossal P-Con fraud. c/o mayesvara dasa

[Facebook December 6th 2022](#) Mayesvara Dasa→Nityananda Das You are very good at avoiding the operative questions that expose how you contrived d to make the entire P-Con up. What happened to the hair samples studied by Dr. Morris with his NAA process.? You know the ones with the "SCIENTIFIC PROOF" high cadmium ratings? *You said they were destroyed during testing. But the whole glory of the NAA process is that it does NOT impact the samples...* so how about some facts from you explaining why this happened if Dr. Morris was so expert. Is it possibly because YOU destroyed the samples? It's quite humorous how a pathological liar like yourself is campaigning for facts!

[Facebook December 7, 2022am](#) Nityananda Das →Mayesvara Dasa That some hair samples' physical integrity was compromised by their NAA tests does not mean MURR tests were faulty. This is your ridiculous faulty logic. *How are you able to critique NAA tests without a written opinion from another world-renowned NAA scientist? ...*

[Facebook December 7, 2022pm](#) Mayesvara Dasa →Nityananda Das It is not I who am critiquing the results of Dr. Morris's work. Everyone in the NAA business says that burning the samples into dust is not supposed to happen. This of course you cannot admit because it destroys your cherished so-called "**Scientific Proof**". Those who accept your pages of hyperbole and Romper-Room reasoning may not be able to conclude the obvious, but it doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize what I am pointing out. If someone who claims to be a world class cook brings his pie out of the oven and it is burnt into charcoal you really have to be an idiot to not wonder just how expert that so-called expert really is!

8.6.1.5 How Did Cadmium Hair Samples End Up As "Dust?"

"He thought no minimum was required for this type of test, that the hair would be left intact..." -Dr. Wadlin, Analytical Laboratories in Chapel Hill NC, KGBG 81

The NAA method of analysis is widely acclaimed because it can be used without destroying the evidence samples tested.

"(The NAA Process Is) **Inherently nondestructive.**" The sample is not permanently damaged by NAA, and in the case of forensic analysis and analysis of rare samples, such as meteorites or archeological finds, the sample can be saved and **even subjected to further analysis at a later time**¹"

"Besides its high sensitivity, NAA's **potential for nondestructive measurement** provides the further advantage that the samples which are measured can be preserved **for production in court or for further tests.**"²

Even Dr. Morris's own laboratory clearly states this simple fact which exposes how fraudulent all your methods are.

"Because NAA is a non-destructive technique with samples typically requiring little or no preparation, samples often can be analyzed repeatedly, even subsequently by other methods if needed. This simplicity in sample preparation also greatly reduces the potential for sample contamination."³

This last citation is from the MURR lab website, *the same lab that tested the three samples of hair allegedly contaminated with large cadmium readings, i.e., (A, D, & Q-2).* However, after the studies were done, *T-Com* tells us they are "*now only dust,*"-KGBG 693, 694 and are no longer suitable for retesting.

The *T-Com* also states:

"...the truth is that...the mass of all the hair samples was more than sufficient for accurate testing results⁽¹⁾ and that AFTER the tests, *they were reduced to dust by the radiation used in neutron activation analysis.*" ⁽²⁾ -LFOTF 2

(1) This is a bias *T-Com* opinion and does not reflect the caveats expressed by Dr. Morris himself: "*...the large uncertainty is the result of the small sample mass (0.00012 grams)*" -July 25, 2005 E-Mail from Dr. Morris, KGBG 210

(2) This is very suspicious. Why would the alleged cadmium laden hair samples A and D be "reduced to dust" when the most important and strategic advantage of the NAA process is that it leaves the samples intact?

The whereabouts of Sample Q-2 is not stated and neither is its condition. Is that an oversight, or are we to just assume it too was reduced to untraceable dust as well?

The *T-Com* offers no explanation for why the most controversial hair samples that they tell us had the highest cadmium-readings, were destroyed despite the fact that the same lab that allegedly destroyed them specifically advertises:

"...**samples often can be analyzed repeatedly**, even subsequently by other methods if needed..."⁴

FROM: **DECEPTION** Chapter 8 "The problems with hair analysis", Section 6, "The Neutron Activation Analysis Process" Part 1. "Serious Reasons to Doubt MURR NAA Reports" Item 5. "How Did Cadmium Hair Samples End Up as Dust?"

¹ Neutron Activation Analysis ,

http://www.theochem.ru.nl/~pwormer/Knowino/knowino.org/wiki/Neutron_activation_analysis.html

² -Dennis S. Karjala, "[Comment, the Evidentiary Uses of Neutron Activation Analysis](http://pers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1438160)", California Law review 59, http://pers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1438160 997,

³ Neutron Activation Analysis University of Missouri, <http://www.acg.missouri.edu/NAA.html>

⁴ Ibid.